UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

SHERRI L. LOVE,

Case No. 2:20-cv-00525-JAD-EJY

Plaintiff,

v.

MEDICAL UNIT E FMWCC, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER** 

Pending before the Court are Plaintiff's Motion for Query and Motion for Various Relief. ECF Nos. 88 and 89. Plaintiff's Motion for Query asks the Court to confirm various discovery deadlines. ECF No. 88 at 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Various Relief asks the Court to "dismiss" the Attorney General's request for attorneys' fees and prevent the Attorney General from presenting evidence of Plaintiff's 2007 criminal charge. ECF No. 89 at 1.

As the Court stated in its last Order "it is inappropriate for the Court to act as counsel for Plaintiff or otherwise advocate for Plaintiff in this action." ECF No. 87 at 1; see also, Pineda v. Hutchins, Case No. 2:20-CV-02312-GMN-BNW, 2021 WL 3709231, at \*2 (D. Nev. Aug. 18, 2021) ("[d]istrict judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to pro se litigants."). Although the Court is mindful of the challenges pro se litigants face, the Court is not an appropriate resource for Plaintiff's continued questions. Plaintiff must read the documents she receives from the Court and otherwise, communicate with opposing counsel regarding discovery issues.

Plaintiff's Motion for Various Relief similarly does not request relief the Court can provide. The Court's role is not to act as an advocate on behalf of Plaintiff, and the Court cannot intervene on Plaintiff's behalf absent legitimate grounds for relief. Defendants are entitled to defend the action against them, which Plaintiff brought voluntarily. As such, Plaintiff is responsible for moving her case forward and cooperating with Defendants throughout these proceedings.

Case 2:20-cv-00525-JAD-EJY Document 91 Filed 03/23/22 Page 2 of 2